

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE
IN AND FOR NEW CASTLE COUNTY

RONALD JOHNSON,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	C.A. No. 05M-12-078 MMJ
v.)	
)	
STATE OF DELAWARE,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

Submitted: February 1, 2006
Decided: March 9, 2006

ORDER

UPON DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

DENIED

Upon review of Movant Ronald G. Johnson (“Defendant”)’s Motion for Reconsideration and the record, it appears to the Court that:

1. On May 31, 2005, Defendant was indicted on nine offenses, including unlawful imprisonment, offensive touching, resisting arrest, menacing and weapons offenses. Defendant’s final case review was held on November 7, 2005, and his criminal trial is scheduled to begin on May 16, 2006.

2. Defendant repeatedly has filed *pro se* petitions for writs of mandamus, which have been denied by this Court as well as by the Delaware Supreme Court.

3. On December 29, 2005, the Supreme Court of Delaware dismissed Defendant's consolidated petitions for extraordinary relief. The petitions requested that the Supreme Court compel the Superior Court, among other things: (a) to release Defendant by *habeas corpus*; (b) to order discovery; (c) to hold an evidentiary hearing; and (d) to dismiss the charges.

4. The Supreme Court noted that between May 13, 2005 and December 29, 2005, Defendant initiated a total of ten *pro se* cases concerning his pending Superior Court criminal matter. The Supreme Court also noted that Defendant's petitions for writs of *habeas corpus*, mandamus and prohibition and other extraordinary relief were dismissed on the grounds that the petitions were repetitive, frivolous and constituted an abuse of judicial process. Consequently, the Supreme Court ruled that, in the absence of a specific Order, the Supreme Court Clerk shall not docket any further *pro se* petitions for extraordinary relief that are filed by Defendant concerning his pending Superior Court criminal case.

5. Since April 2005, Defendant has filed nineteen criminal motions with the Superior Court. Since May 2005, Defendant also has filed seven petitions for writs of *habeas corpus*, and one petition for a writ of mandamus in this Court.

Defendant's current Motion for Reconsideration is another effort by Defendant to rehash issues that already have been considered multiple times.

THEREFORE, the Superior Court finds that consideration of Defendant's repetitive and frivolous motions constitute an abuse of the Court's judicial process. In the absence of a specific Order of this Court, the Prothonotary shall not docket any further *pro se* petitions for extraordinary relief filed by Defendant concerning his pending Superior Court criminal case. Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration is hereby **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Honorable Mary M. Johnston

ORIGINAL: PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE - CIVIL DIV.